

## Part II – TAJIKISTAN - Parliamentary Elections in 2000

For the first time the parliamentary elections were held in Tajikistan on February 27 2000. They gave chance for political parties to have mandatory seats in one of the Houses of Parliament-Majlisi Namoyandagon. Out of 63 seats of the lower chamber 22 seats were given to the deputies – representatives of political parties, who were nominated by the united republican okrug and overcame 5% barrier.

Primarily 10 seats in Majlisi Namoyandagon were made as a quote. But later the Committee on National Reconciliation suggested that the quote should be increased to 22 seats and it was supported by President of Tajikistan Emomali Rahmonov.

This apportionment of deputy seats for political parties in Majlisi Namoyandogon made more than a third part of the whole seats. This fact increased the role of parties in political life of the republic. In the final variant of the Law on Majlisi Oli elections status of 22 deputies in Majlisi Namoyandagon was established. Elected according to the political parties rolls candidates must be nominated at the congresses of the registered political parties.

According to the Common Agreement about Peace and National Reconciliation in Tajikistan between the government and the United Tajik Opposition on June 27, 1997, 30 % of seats in government bodies were given to the UTO. 4 UTO representatives out of 15 members of the Central Election Committee were included into the Central Committee on Elections and Referendums in Tajikistan. The others were the representatives of the ruling National Democratic Party of Tajikistan and 1 representative of the Communist Party of Tajikistan. When the President of Tajikistan represented the candidates of CCER in Majlisi Oli actually they had been not submitted to political parties approval. The Party of Equity (“Adilathoh”) and the Social Party were not included at all.

“After different kinds of “cleaning” only 6 parties out of 10 in Tajikistan entered on a list”- says Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Tujgun Karimov. “These 6 parties were registered by the Ministry of Justice according to the Law on political parties. This law was elaborated after more than two year agreement by the Committee on National Reconciliation and was approved by Majlisi Oli of the first convocation, after serious settlements.” (Newspaper “Voice of Tajikistan” # 1-2, June, 2001, p. 4)

The observers pay attention to the fact that democratic alternative of elections in 2000 took place. The government representatives appreciated elections in 2000 and cited an example in Kulob city, where state authorities tried to see off to the Parliament a woman-candidate, but this attempt wasn’t successful. So the elections were democratic.

The negative facts of these elections were the following: during the formation of the election committees in the okrugs the opinion of political parties wasn't taken into account, in some cases (Geleznodorognj one mandatory electoral okrug) the committee staff was changed during the elections.

As a result, 6 political parties, using their right to nominate candidates by the united republican okrug, took part in the Parliamentary elections in 2000. The day before the activities of the Agrarian party of Tajikistan headed by Khikmatullo Nasretdinov and the Social-Democratic Party headed by Rakhmatullo Zoirov had been suspended by the Supreme Court. The formal cause for it was a lack of 1000 followers in most parts of the republic and party members denied their signatures when being checked by the Ministry of Justice.

As a result of "cleaning"(Tujgun Karimov) 6 parties nominated 108 candidates for 22 seats in Maglisi Namoyandagon: 21 – the National Democratic Party of Tajikistan, 20 – the Communist Party of Tajikistan, 15 – the Party of Islamic Revival of Tajikistan, 19 – the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, 15 – the Party "Adilathoh" (Equity), 18 – the Socialist Party of Tajikistan.

276 candidates, 225 registered, were nominated by 41 one mandatory election okrugs. On the day of voting 191 candidates were included into secret ballots.

It is absolutely true, that possibility to elect deputies by party lists played an important role in the development of pluralism in Tajikistan and meant the increase of the role of multi party system of the society.

It was a new stage of pluralism. However the society and the state approached it with considerable disadvantages, failures and negative moments. Firstly the lack of experience of political parties to participate in such kind of elections should be noted. As a result party functionaries, sometimes not well known to the electorate, were included into party lists.

Moreover, at the congresses of some political parties a heated argument developed between party functionaries for them to be included candidates for a republican okrug. For example this situation took place in the oldest political party – the Communist Party of Tajikistan. The observers noted that principles of fellowship and mutual understanding were forgotten at its congress. It conveyed in the fact that, CPT Presidium recommendations – the ruling party main body – were not supported. At the end of the discussions it was decided to nominate candidates by the regional principle. As a result gender problems developed. A few women were included into CPT candidate party lists. They weren't included into the fist five at all. Youth and non-party representatives were not included either.

Thus, on CPT example we can see how general situation in the country influences the political processes, its breaking with the norms of political life: regional principle came forward, like in many other processes in Tajikistan. The system of candidate nomination

adopted by the communists in the past was forgotten. Women were less nominated than in other parties.

The Party of Islamic Revival of Tajikistan had other problems. It tried to enlarge its electorate by winning over to its side well – known persons in the country, as they understood well the odious in nominating only religious party figures. For example it included women into party lists. The principle of authorized people being included into the rolls was a leading fact for PIRT. We think this fact explains why they limited party candidate list in Maglisi Namoyandagon, as it had been said before, only by 15 members.

The list of candidates of the National Democratic Party of Tajikistan was more balanced. Gender problems were taken into consideration. Though more authoritarian appreciation of party list staff can be supposed. Some analysts characterize the situation in NDPT as a continuation of communism but without communists and their ideals. The party nominated 22 candidates. 6 of them were women. But only 21 candidates were included into the last variant. Candidate Shamsullo Djabirov, deputy Minister of Security, died during the election campaign in a famous attempt upon a life of the Mayor of Dushanbe, February 16, 2000.

In our opinion, young parties, especially the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, the Socialist Party of Tajikistan, the Party of Equity (Adolathoh) had a lack of prominent people of a republic wide scale. So they had fewer candidates in the party lists. Many famous statesmen, public figures, scientists and artists restrained their political arrogance during the civil war in the 90s. At present they hold non-party position and follow national interests. Though at the beginning of tajik events many of them took an active part in the political struggle.

It is characteristic that NDPT and PIRT leaders didn't head the party candidate lists. It is clear with NDTP, because the law prohibits for a head of the state – the President of RT –to be a Maglisi Namoyandagon deputy at the same time. According to the Constitution there exists an authority division. But the situation with PIRT leader Said Abdullohi Nury is different. We consider that he didn't want as a leader of the former United Tajik Opposition to be limited only by one party list, thus having claims on religious- political leadership all over the country. Being aware of it he didn't wish to be alternative for President Emomali Rahmonov in post conflict Tajikistan, strengthening peace and stability.

Also it should be said that some authoritative artists and scientists of Tajikistan, being members of different parties, didn't wish to refuse heading their structures by being nominated Maglisi Namoyandagon deputies.

It is necessary to stress the legal defense of voting papers. Before parliamentary elections 2000 everybody understood and expected discrepancies of objective electorate will to final results of elections as secret ballot papers didn't have legal defense of sufficient degree. In particular they were printed in different printing-offices and on the paper having no defense degree. There was a lack of real control of political parties and

international observers over the voting process. Local executive authorities made key influence on it.

The Communist Party of Tajikistan, the Social-Democratic Party of Tajikistan, the Socialist Party of Tajikistan and other opposing parties representatives attract attention to the lack of specific procedures maintenance, such as a protocol copy issuing to the observers during the voting, written not in a pencil, but in a pen, as it excludes falsification of voting results, the necessity of ballot defense, warning the election organizers about the possibility of holding criminal responsibility for violating voting process. During elections 2000 there was no real possibility for judicial bodies to consider complaints and statements about voting violations.

Administrative resource influence was seen everywhere. At the same time it should be noted that it revealed the following features.

As an example we can have a short dialogue at the round table, organized by the International Fund on Election System IFES and the National Association of Political Scientists of Tajikistan on April 2, 2004 with a group of Majlisi Oli deputies and leaders of a number of parties of Tajikistan. This dialogue was written down by one of the authors of this book.

The participants of the round table again and again spoke about non-interference of executive authorities into the election process. In this case deputy Sh. Salimov's opinion (an NDPT member), speaking about the following fact during parliamentary elections 2000, deserves attention: "In 23 okrugs the so-called "influential" people were nominated and registered by the Central Election Committee, though they didn't belong to any democratic party. What would happen with the Parliament, if these people were "elected" in Majlisi Namoyandagon? It could really happen, if the authorities didn't interfere with it. You see, CEC registered them. It is impossible to form Central Election Committees and to hold elections without authority participation and interference with this process." –the deputy finished his speech on this question.

R. Zoirov, the chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Tajikistan, explained his opinion on interference or non-interference into the election process: "Office of public prosecutor, other power bodies should do their duty. But they shouldn't interfere with the elections, poll and the process of counting votes". He also said that the people, who hold elections, must be independent, attracting attention to the fact when district ruling bodies were the election committee members.

Meanwhile we should agree this argument is lawful – there exist facts of inseparability of election committees and executive bodies and it is necessary that the election committees should be independent on the executive body.

The question about the so-called "influential" people, supported by arms, in Tajikistan at present moment should be explained. The whole system of warlordism was inherited by the country after the Civil War. At present, President Emomali Rahmonov with the help of

other political forces continues the campaign of overcoming non adequate signs of warlordism, aiming at conservation of all past stages of transitional period of country development. Warlordism played a positive role in a peaceful process ( the word “warlord” is a combination of two English words war and lord, that is a prince; in tajik – jangsollor). Warlordism is a peaceful agreement between the leaders and field commanders, possessing war-political resources. They got them during war conflicts and now in a post conflict period they control them. Owing to warlordism a war conflict was overcome in Tajikistan in a short period.

But in some other cases warlordism produces problems.

By the end of 1999 and at the beginning of 2000 a part of warlords tried to become independent in holding Parliamentary Elections 2000. It was about it but in other words deputy Sh. Salimov spoke at the round table. Warlordism activity in 2000 threatened by the future country militarization and in particular militarization of the legislative body – Majlisi Oli. The process of militarisation could come to naught all attempts on creating professional parliament.

The fact that the central election committees registered “influential people” as Majlisi Namoyandagon deputy candidates shows how CEC and local executive authorities are weak in the provinces, as they can’t resist threatens of this kind of authoritarianism and militarism by their own means. That time the government made all this in central order. On the other hand, in many other cases warlords act with the local authorities and have leading economical influence. It can be said that in some degree warlord peaceful agreement system created the present state. Our state is still warlord with all its contradictions. We speak not only about famous political figures, but also about people of different classes, who joined political structures. Some of them integrated legal norms. But another part joined legal institutes formally only to have power and their share of common pie.

The considerable warlordism overcoming characterizes the present situation in Tajikistan. Though this process isn’t finished.

Speaking about negative moments of last elections the following form of administrative resource used by the authorities should be noted. The fact is that the formation of one mandatory election okrug on the territory of some administrative – territorial units { regions} especially in mountain regions hampered the real possibility of nominating party candidates in these okrugs. For example, in MBAD, Garm districts and the part of Istaravshan region and Shahrstan of Sogdian oblast the party candidates weren’t nominated by one mandatory okrug. Only the National Democratic Party of Tajikistan used its administrative resource.

Last parliamentary elections in 2000 were also characterized by the lack of competition. Thus two candidates passed to the second voting round. But then one of them was discharged either by the election committee decision or the court decision for

some violations during election campaign. These facts took place in Asht region, Khujant election okrug, Vakhsh and some others.

Besides, the law doesn't stipulate to establish real voting results according to the quantity of given votes in a republican okrug. Judicial bodies of Tajikistan refused to consider statements of a number of political parties on voting results by the united republican election okrug in some regions of Tajikistan. They explained it by the fact that they have no right to reconsider final voting results, announced by the Central Election Committee.

The last fact shows there is a lack of real power division in the country as an important sign of democracy, though formally it is proclaimed in Constitution.

The possibility to appeal election results in administrative-territorial regions wasn't stipulated by Maglisi Oli Law on elections in 1999. It was allowed to appeal election results only in a united republican okrug, that's only in the country. This is what article 48 of the Constitutional law on Majlisi Oli elections of RT in 1999 declares. Evaluating election results in Majlisi Namoyandagont it contemplates that the Central Committee on Elections and Referendums makes its own conclusions according to the protocols of district election committees and states election results in the united electoral okrug totally in the country.

As a result the Supreme Court of Tajikistan refused to consider a statement of a party against election results in 15 administrative – territorial units of Tajikistan. It was the Communist Party of Tajikistan that made a statement.

The characteristic feature of last parliamentary elections was ballot destruction immediately after announcing election results. That is there was no order in keeping and using election documents, in particular secret vote ballots. That's why the Supreme Court of Tajikistan didn't consider statements as there was no real possibility of checking and identifying ballots.

Equally with all these facts which promoted the increase of the level of the election unlegalization, some other facts should be noted. In January 2000 the Central Committee on Elections and Referendums in Tajikistan in centralized order assigned inadequate sum of money to each party to hold elections. It was equivalent to 113 USD, that time it was 200 rublov and 23 USD (40 rublov) to each candidate in one mandatory okrug. In other words the election campaign wasn't financed adequately.

It is natural that the parties and the candidates did not keep limited norms. In its recommendations the Central Election Committee had to allow for the parties and the candidates to use their own money to finance the election campaign. Thus the sum should be equivalent to 2270 USD (4 million rublov) for a party and 284 USD (500 rublov) for each candidate. CEC recommendations contradicted to the law, but it was extreme measure. Article 9 of the Law prohibits candidates and parties to use their own money for

financing an election campaign. That is, nobody controlled finances and it was in the interests of the ruling party and the candidates with wide pockets,

As a classic says: there are negative facts, but they give positive results.

The positive moments caused by last parliamentary elections are the following:

1. All political parties including NDPT realized their unpreparedness to hold multi party elections.

2. Most opposing parties came to a conclusion to create coalition to control parliamentary elections effectively.

3. Political parties realized that party followers should be taught the law on elections in Tajikistan.

4. Political parties realized the drawbacks in the law on elections which was effective that time and they addressed with the initiative to introduce alterations into the law on Majlisi Oli elections.

5. Political parties realized the necessity to reorganize their structures to approach closer to electorate.

6. They realized the necessity to establish their own printing-offices and mass media.

7. They understood clearly that they should cooperate with NGOs and international organizations, which have the experience in holding elections on multi party basis.

8. After analyzing the parliamentary election results in 2000 the parties realized that the Central Committees on Elections and Referendums in Tajikistan should be formed, approximately, 129 days before elections, to hold other election events earlier to have much time for election committees to study the Law on elections. "When on December 10, 1999 the Law on elections was adopted, none of the central election committees got acquainted with it for being short of time – chairman of CDPT R. Zoirov said in one of his speeches.

But the most positive fact of Majlisi Oli Elections 2000 was the lack of Article 32 on paying election pledge at a rate of 200 minimum salaries for each nominated candidate on CEC account.

Inequality of real rights among political parties during the election campaign in 2000 was revealed by mass media too. Such newspapers as "Jumhuriat" (The Republic), "Sadoi Mardum" (Voice of the Nation), "National Newspaper," financed by the government, 70% of their information space devoted to the activity of the President, the government and the ruling NDPT. There were the cases when all newspaper edition was abolished, if it tried to report events concerning the opposition. It happened with newspaper "Sadoi Kanibadam" ( Voice of Kanibadam; publisher–Khukumat of Kanibadam) as it reported about the meeting of opposition leader Said Abdullohi Nuri with the electors.

The following drawback concerning administrative resources used by the ruling party should be noted too. Duration of time for political advertising especially on Government TV

was not equal for all 6 parties. The National Democratic Party of Tajikistan used 39 % of the given time, PIRT – 14%, CPT - only 6%.

There were no political debates. Only debates with the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, the Communist Party of Tajikistan and the Party of Equity “Adolathoh” were conducted on TV. But debates of all 6 parties were prohibited by CCER in the future. This position wasn't right because unwillingness of the ruling party NDPT to take part in debates isn't a reason to prohibit debates of other parties.

Political parties showed that they were not ready to hold Majlisi Oli elections 2000, because they couldn't fulfill total control of multiparty elections all over the country. About 3000 electoral districts were formed in the country. The member of the Central Committee on Elections and Referendums M. Dodojonov stressed that “while forming the election committees we had to look for the representatives of other parties even at the markets. They were absent in many districts. In the Republic of Tajikistan there are 3000 electoral districts, and it is necessary about 15000 members of other parties to observe the elections.”

Nothing can be said against it. Actually it is a real problem of other parties except NDPR and CNT. The NDPT deputies don't complain of the absence of their representatives in oblasts and regions of the country while forming election committees, and in our opinion it is evidence that they don't have “a headache” on the problem of party paucity. Possibly it is evidence that on a definite stage of its development NDPT turned into a party, which has the character of state institute like ubiquitous CPSU. But not only Tajikistan has such problems. Many ruling parties in other countries of Central Asia have this kind of character. It is peculiar heritage of communism in the post communist period. Though, it should be said that in other countries there are parties which cover all social classes and geographical territory of the countries.

The following fact also can be relevant to last elections. The observers of the political parties didn't cooperate with each other. The result of it observation wasn't effective. A small number of observers and lack of cooperation gave possibility to abuse the law.

Last parliamentary elections showed the political parties in what directions they should work to make future elections just and transparent. One of the most important questions is the terms of forming election committees and their training during optimal periods.

Parliamentary elections 2000 cardinally advanced a problem of terms of democracy arising in Tajikistan and this question is often discussed in public policy.

In the speeches of the NDPT representatives we could often hear that the cause of many problems was the extreme youngness of democracy in Tajikistan. As a rule there is a point of view that the Law on elections in 1999 really was not perfect, but in many cases it met adopted international norms of democracy. They consider that we should not demand the developed forms of democracy, arising in the West as a result of centuries-old development, in Tajikistan. Of course democracy in Tajikistan develops at slow space, but

today we live in 2004 and there is a great deference between Tajikistan today and Tajikistan, let us say, in 1992. As the election system of countries with the developed democracy has a centuries-old history.

In connection with the question on the pace of democracy arising their opponents from opposing parties speak about two aspects of democracy. Really some forms of democracy had been developing for centuries, for example, mature forms of multiparty. But there exist such factors of democracy, which define if democracy exists. Transparency of elections is such form of democracy.

Many scientists and politicians discuss the question about the character of democracy in home and international press and literature, during seminars and at the conferences. However, it can be said with confidence: most of international law defenders and their organizations always express fear when politicians of different countries declare about their own particular way of democracy development and demand to wait till democracy reaches maturity.

We are convinced that “democracy maturity” shouldn’t be waited for. It will never mature, if today the confirmation of the most important democracy demands – elections should be transparent and honest – are not reached. Unfortunately, parliamentary elections in 2000 did not reach this aim. Just the other way round, courage to take part in honest elections demands from the parties including the ruling NDPT to mobilize all power every day –the whole potential of the party, to learn rules of democracy and such ways of organization of practical life in order to reach their aim by using really democratic forms of work. Of course, great efforts should be made, mobilizing all existing chances.

Last parliamentary elections in 2000 are evaluated by the character of the processes, going after under their influence. The elections brought together positions and actions of the opposing parties, it conveyed in their future coalitions.

The opposing parties could overcome their deep differences and joined together to hold future elections in an honest and transparent way. The example of it is the debates in Political Discussion Club, organized by UNO Bureau on peacemaking in Tajikistan and the National Association of Political Scientists of Tajikistan in different regions.

According to the observation of one of the authors of this book, participating in PDC as an expert, after elections in 2000 the representatives of the political parties criticized each other little. The edge of the criticism was directed, first of all, against the ruling party - NDPT.

Practical questions were supported badly by theoretical generalizations or arguments from the representatives of the parties during public discussions. Apparently, it had been done within the bounds of public discussions among the party itself as in public policy it doesn’t unite parties but opposes to each other. This is a characteristic feature of the following political situation, which can be defined as intention of opposing parties to take joint actions against the present administration.

This fact deserves special attention. Warm relations between the communist leaders and the leaders of political Islam and other party leaders are evidence of a considerable change in their psychology and political consciousness. Now everybody understands it is necessary that a range of questions should not be discussed during joint public meetings. This fact deserves of particular attention. It should be said that the themes and questions for public discussions weren't outlined by anybody. They were defined by the life itself and political situation after February 2000.

In other words there is a great distance between inner processes in the parties and the processes on the level of open public consciousness and discussion. We think that this is the fact of political culture of peacemaking in post war Tajikistan. If someone can perceive this fact as an evidence of self censorship and freedom of speech limitation, then it should be specially noted that really they were arisen by the wish to keep peace in the country where political forces, extremely opposing to each other by their positions and opinions are still existing but longing to unite.

So we can speak about concrete transformation or adaptation of political culture to political situation arisen under the influence of results of parliamentary elections in 2000.

Analyzing the previous Parliamentary elections, Chairman of the Socialist Party of Tajikistan Mirkhusen Narziev said the following: "The authorities didn't let all parties participate equally in the elections. However, the positive moment was that parliamentary elections in 2000 were multi parties. All 6 parties existing that time nominated their candidates both in one mandatory okrugs and by party lists.

The drawbacks and negative moments of parliamentary elections in 2000 were connected, first of all, with the drawbacks of the Law on Majlisi Oli elections existing that time. These drawbacks were the following. Firstly, the representatives of the parties didn't participate in the election committees. Secondly, the ballots weren't legally defended. Thirdly, both home and foreign observers didn't have a full control over the elections. The conditions for objective control weren't created. The transparence of elections wasn't provided either. The fourth moment was that in a number of electoral districts election results were announced only after four or five days. The most important drawback was that existing legal institutions – courts- did nothing to investigate the cases of violation during the elections".

Vice-chairman of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan Rahmatullo Valiev was also interviewed.

Question: Mr Valiev, how do you estimate elections in 2000, what positive and negative moments can you mention ?

Reply: The Democratic Party of Tajikistan had little possibility for equal participation because only on January,1 the party was allowed to implement its political activity in the country. It was done by the Supreme Court of Tajikistan. So we had little time to get ready

for the elections. As these elections were held according to party lists, they were the first of that kind for the people of Tajikistan. Many people didn't know and understand what election party list meant. It was characteristic. If we compare the Law on Majlisi Oli elections of 1999 with the current law, it was more democratic. However political parties were not ready to use maximum possibilities of the previous law and that is why they were not able to control election process. As a result there were a lot of falsifications made by the district and okrug election committees. So the political parties were quite dissatisfied. They expressed their dissatisfaction by making statements to regional and oblast courts and the Supreme Court of Tajikistan. The Democratic Party of Tajikistan made several statements and complaints that the results of parliamentary elections in 2000 were not admitted were brought to regional and oblast courts and the Supreme Court of Tajikistan. On results of Majlisi Namoyandagon elections in 2000 the Democratic Party of Tajikistan declared that it wouldn't admit the results of the elections. There were a lot of violations and we fixed them and we have all necessary documents, on the basis of which we declared the elections in 2000 null and void.

Mr Valiev tells the following about the work of Mass Media while getting ready for the elections:

"Unfortunately that time Mass Media was not independent. We had separate party newspapers, but in the whole there was not independent Mass Media in Tajikistan. We were given 10-15 minutes to appear on TV of Tajikistan. Newspapers reported about our activity insignificantly. This wasn't sufficient for each party to advertise and speak about its activity."

Secretary of CC CPT T. Karimov says the following: "These were the first multiparty elections in the history of Tajikistan. Their results were quite unexpected for the authorities. The Communist Party gained half of votes in a united republican electoral okrug according to the reports of the representatives of the political parties in the election committees of different levels. It is indirectly supported by the fact that the Central Committee on Elections and Referendums informed only in three (!) days that NDTP won by party lists gaining 70 (!)% of votes. But in two days it was obliged to make amendments, reserving for NDPT- 64, 9%, the Communist Party – 20, 9%, the Islamic Party of Revival – 7, 31% of votes. The rest three parties- Adolathoh, the Democratic and the Socialist Parties didn't overcome 5 % barrier."

Vice- president of the National Democratic Party of Tajikistan Davlatali Davlatov describes the parliamentary elections 2000 in different words.

"Last parliamentary elections 2000 differed from all elections ever held in Tajikistan. The difference was the following: the elections were held after political reforms being carried out in the republic, after peaceful agreements being made, after a new text of the Constitution being adopted and after the Law on political parties and a new Law on elections, creating a basis to hold democratic elections in the country. According to the

newly made amendments in the Constitution of the Republic for the first time in Tajikistan the bicameral permanent active parliament was established and according to the Law on Elections all registered political parties took part in the elections for the first time. The representatives of political parties participated in the work on holding elections. Representatives of Mass Media and international organizations were present in election committees. All these facts can allow us to say that parliamentary elections in 2000 differed radically from the elections held before. Nowadays taking into account proposals of international observers joint efforts were made to improve a new law on elections. It became more perfect and democratic.

Vice-chairman of SDPT Shokir Hakimov said the following on the question of positive and negative moments of last elections.

Reply: The positive moment was that the elections were held on the multiparty base for the first time and within the framework of the Common Agreement on Establishing Peace and National Amity in Tajikistan. Sufficient number of the representatives of UNO, OCSE and other international organizations were present at the elections as observers. Besides, Mass Media, though in a limited way, contributed to the development of pluralism and for the first time the proportional election system worked and a one mandatory system in combination with nomination of independent candidates worked as well. There are three political parties in the parliament. Formally NDPT has the constitutional majority. OCSE, UNO, БДИПЧ made the monitoring, saying that there were a lot of cases of violation and a great number of cases of falsification took place. There were a lot of complaints. The insufficient reporting of the elections was the following authoritarian fact. The negative moment was newspapers “Asia plus”, “Vechernij Dushanbe”, “Charhi Gardin” in tajik rendered assistance to the party of authority. A lot of statements were made to the judicial bodies. The interference with the election process was made and though on the eve the decree on increasing women’s role in the society was issued, a limited number of the women took part in the elections. In the whole the elections in 2000 increased confrontation. Five parties are dissatisfied and only one party is satisfied with the elections. Today we have the executive authority uncontrolled by the parliament. As a result the executive authority formalizes any of its decisions through the parliament”.

Just the other way round manager of the personnel of CK ВПР Muhibullo Dodojonov represents last elections in a favourable light. This is a fragment of his speech at one of the meetings on October 30, 2002. “The Central Election Committee of Republic of Tajikistan – he said- reacted to any call, statement and complaint on the violation of electoral legislation opportunely. The registration of some candidates to deputies was abolished by its decisions, in some electoral okrugs the elections were held invalid for the law violation and re-elections were held. The interference of municipal authorities in estimating election results was ascertained in Khorog okrug. The re-elections were held here too.”

At the same time M. Dodojonov stressed: "Last election campaign revealed that we didn't succeed in fully implementing the elections on alternative basis including the election of Majlisi Milli members, in participating of every elector personally in the voting process. The election committees of all levels especially district should adhere to the law precisely, solve the arising problems legally competently in order to avoid completely pressure on their activity. Institutions, enterprises, organizations, state bodies should contribute to make proper conditions for the work of these committees as it is mentioned in the Law on the elections".

On February 27, 2000 after holding elections on the results of joint mission on observing the elections UNO mission of observers and Tajikistan, OCSE, IFES and stressed the following:

1. The law on Majlisi Oli elections couldn't guarantee the independence of election committees.
2. The law wasn't able to implement clear division between authority body and election committees.
3. The law wasn't able to implement the minimum level of transparency during elector registration, ballot printing, early special voting, in particular during vote counting, announcing and publishing and election results.
4. The law couldn't implement adequate instruction for Mass Media.
5. The law fixed extreme limited norms on financing the election campaign and distributing these means.

I.K ASADULLAEV

Extract from: *"Tajikistan: Guide to Parliamentary Elections 2005. Dushanbe, 2004. 122 pages."*